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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

Yes, the question is new and defined - exploring the implementation of a new protocol for epitasix treatment requiring no admission to the hospital.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

The methods are appropriate, more description would strengthen the manuscript. For example, the power analysis/sample size calculation is not included in the article. The sample size of 60 seems inadequate. Also, the authors state that 10 out of 44 patients had complications. Although they were managed at home and did not require hospital admission, continued bleeding is a complication. Also, it appears that day #2 was when the majority of complications occurred.

However, at the end of the manuscript, the authors state that there was "only 1 significant complication." Definitions of complications versus significant complications would strengthen the manuscript.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

Data appear sound. The manuscript did not present or discuss "controls" for the study.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Not sure this was addressed by the authors.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

The manuscript does present statistically significant findings (the N was small), however, were they clinically significant? This question was not addressed thoroughly except to say that 201 hospital days could be potentially saved.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

No, the authors did conduct an retrospective audit, but they also developed, implemented, and evaluated a new protocol.

7. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes, there are a few run-on, very long sentences, i.e. abstract and background sections.

RECOMMENDATION: Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)